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SUMMARY OF PROJECT, ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS
AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Project Summary

The project involves the construction of a 1,600 square foot metal structure adjacent to the existing fire station. The new structure would secure and house the new fire truck, water tanker and a 4-wheel drive off-road emergency vehicle. The facility will also serve as a training area, equipment storage area, a command center for major incidents and an emergency operations center during disasters.

The purpose of the project is to expand and improve the scope of fire protection, emergency medical assistance, and for civil defense readiness for the area.

Short Term Impacts

Construction Impacts: Landclearing and construction activities will produce short-term impacts to noise, air quality, traffic, access and scenery.

Mitigation Measure: During any construction with the potential to cause sedimentation or other pollution, the County of Hawaii will require the contractor to adhere to Best Management Practices to avoid such impacts.

Long Term Impacts

No adverse long-term impacts are expected to result from the project, as there are no sensitive biological, hydrological or historic resources present at the site. The improvement of public health and safety is a long-term benefit of the project.

Mitigation Measure: If any human remains, charcoal deposits or artifacts are encountered during construction, work will cease immediately and the State Historic Preservation Division will be consulted to determine the appropriate mitigation.
PART 1: PROJECT LOCATION, PURPOSE AND NEED

1.1 Project Location and Land Ownership

The project is located in Pahala, Ka‘u District, on the Island of Hawaii (Figs 1-3). The County of Hawaii plans to expand the existing Pahala Fire Station, which is located on the makai portion of TMK 9-6-23:44. The mauka portion of the parcel is occupied by the Pahala Park.

The Pahala Fire Station Expansion would add a 1,600 square foot structure that will be used to secure and house the new fire truck, water tanker and a 4-wheel drive off-road emergency vehicle (Fig. 4). The structure would be framed and faced in metal and would have a corrugated metal roof. The facility will also serve as a training area, equipment storage area, a command center for major incidents and an emergency operations center during disasters.

1.2 Purpose and Need for Action

The purpose of the project is to expand and improve the scope of fire protection, emergency medical assistance, and for civil defense readiness for the area. Ka‘u is the largest of 9 districts on the Big Island, occupying nearly one-quarter of the island’s total land area. Population is sparse and widely scattered. Supplying the district with public services is difficult due to the large service area and the limited state of existing facilities. The situation would be improved by the expansion of the Pahala Fire Station facility.

1.3 Summary of Regulatory Requirements

This Environmental Assessment (EA) process was conducted in accordance with NEPA, CEQ's and HUD’s implementing regulations, Chapter 343 of the Hawaii Revised Statutes (HRS) and its implementing regulations, Title 11, Chapter 200, of the Hawaii Administrative Rules (HAR). Chapter 343 of the Hawaii Revised Statutes (HRS) is the basis for the environmental impact process in the State of Hawaii. The content requirements and procedures of Chapter 343, HRS, and its implementing regulations, Title 11, Chapter 200, of the Hawaii Administrative Rules (HAR), are similar to NEPA and its implementing regulations. A major additional requirement is the need to explicitly evaluate whether impacts are significant according to thirteen specific criteria. Part 5 lists these criteria and the findings of the County of Hawaii regarding significance. Part 4 provides the determination of the County of Hawaii.
1.4 Public Involvement and Agency Coordination

The following agencies have been consulted during the Environmental Assessment Process:

- Hawaii County Planning Department
- Hawaii County Parks and Recreation Department
- State Department of Land and Natural Resources, Historic Preservation Division
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

The author spoke with Leinaala Enos and Clyde Silva, officers of several community organizations in the area, concerning the project. A field visit was conducted with Mr. Silva, on December 18, 1998, at which time a member of the Hawaii County Parks and Recreation Department and the Fire Department were also consulted.

Notice of the availability of the Draft EA was published by the Hawaii State Office of Environmental Quality Control (OEQC) in the Environmental Notice of 8 May 1999. This initiated a 30-day comment period during which the public and agencies were invited to respond to the Draft EA with comments or questions. Eight comment letters were received. These letters and the responses to them are included as Appendix 1B. The Final EA was revised in portions to incorporate corrections or clarifications supplied by these letters.

PART 2: ALTERNATIVES

2.1 Proposed Project

The proposed project is described in Section 1.1 and illustrated in Figure 4. The Pahala Fire Station Multi-Purpose Facility project will cost approximately $75,000. The bidding process will begin in early 1999 and construction will take place shortly thereafter. Construction should last approximately one month, and the project is expected to be completed by Summer 1999.

2.2 No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, the Pahala Fire Station would not be expanded and a new 1,600 square foot garage/storage, training/coordination structure would not be built. No temporary construction-related impacts would occur and none of the benefits to public health and safety would be realized. Under this alternative, the large area served by the facility would continue to be underserved, especially in the event of simultaneous emergencies.

2.3 Alternatives Evaluated and Dismissed

No other alternatives capable of addressing the project's purpose and need were identified during the project development or scoping for this Environmental Assessment.
2.4 Selected Alternative

The County of Hawaii has considered the information collected for the Draft EA and the comments received in response to its publication and decided to implement the Proposed Project Alternative.

PART 3: ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES

3.1 Basic Geographic Setting

Figure 6 provides a front view of the existing fire station, where the proposed improvement would be located. Land use/cover in the area proposed for the facility currently consists mainly of a flat, paved surface adjacent to a grass-covered embankment, part of which will be removed and paved.

The surface geology of the site consists of Waiaha Silt Loam (WAD). This shallow, well-drained soil occurs on moderately sloping to moderately steep uplands. The soil was formed in volcanic ash and is underlain with Pahoehoe bedrock at depths of 15 to 20 inches. Annual rainfall is 20 to 40 inches (Giambelucca et al. 1986). Permeability is moderately rapid, runoff is medium and the erosion hazard is moderate (U.S. Soil Conservation Service 1973).

3.2 Physical Environment

3.2.1 Drainage

Environmental Setting, Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The site for the proposed facility is located in Zone X, defined as areas outside the 500 year floodplain, on the Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM) prepared by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (Fig 5). The site is not located on or near any major waterways, rivers or streams – the flood hazard associated with this site is negligible.

3.2.2 Lava Flow and Earthquake Hazards

Environmental Setting

The entire Big Island is subject to geologic hazards, especially lava flows and earthquakes. The project site is located in Lava Flow Hazard Zone 3 (on a scale of ascending risk 9 to 1). Zone 3 is considered “less hazardous than Zone 2 [which is adjacent to and downslope of active risk zones] because of greater distance from recently active vents and/or because the topography makes it less likely that flows will cover these areas” (Heliker 1990). As such, there is some risk of lava inundation over relatively short time scales.
In terms of seismic risk, the entire Island of Hawaii is rated Zone 4 Seismic Probability Rating (Uniform Building Code, Appendix Chapter 25, Section 2518). Zone 4 areas are at risk from major earthquake damage, especially to structures that are poorly designed or built.

**Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

In general, geologic conditions impose no constraints on the project. Although the project is located in an area exposed to geologic hazard, any facility that would service residents of this area must be located within such an area, and there are thus no reasonable alternatives.

*Mitigation Measure: All construction will conform with lateral load specifications according the Uniform Building Code in order to reduce potential damage from location in a high seismic risk area.*

3.2.3 **Flora and Fauna, Wetlands, and Threatened and Endangered Species**

**Flora and Fauna**

Section 7 of the federal Endangered Species Act requires federal agencies undertaking actions that may affect listed or candidate endangered species to consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. This agency was consulted via letter regarding the potential presence of listed, candidate or proposed threatened or endangered animal or plant species in the area. The agency was informed that area within and around the proposed facility has been extensively altered. The proposed site and all bordering parcels have been graded and no signs of any native or otherwise sensitive biota of any kind are present. The project site is mostly graded except for a small embankment which contains a lawn (see Fig. 6). No listed, candidate or proposed endangered animal or plant species were found on the property. In terms of conservation value, no botanical or zoological resources requiring special protection appear to be present. According to their reply of 25 February 1999 (see coordination letters, Appendix 1), the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service concurs that the proposed project will not affect any listed, proposed, or candidate species.

**Wetlands and Aquatic Habitat**

No wetlands or Waters of the U.S. would be built upon, dredged or filled as part of the project. This project will not impact wetlands or aquatic habitat.

**Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Because of the lack of native flora and fauna, no adverse impacts would occur as a result of clearing and improvements, and no mitigation is proposed.
3.2.4 Air Quality, Noise, and Scenic Resources

Environmental Setting

Air pollution in the Pahala area from manmade sources is minimal. Volcanic emissions of sulfur dioxide convert into particulate sulfate which causes a volcanic haze (vog) to blanket the area during occasional episodes when trade winds are not present. The site is located within attainment area and not adjacent to a CO source that generates CO in excess of the 8-hour standard of 10 mg/m³ at the project site.

Noise levels on the site are derived from on-site training activities; equipment and vehicle maintenance, and operation; and off-site noise from traffic, residences and the recreation center adjacent. By its nature as a fire station, the site is not noise-sensitive. Adjacent land use is recreational, hospital and residential, and thus is noise-sensitive to some degree.

Figure 6 provides a view of the project site. The proposed location of the new structure lies sheltered between the existing facility and a grass-covered embankment, largely shielding the facility from external view except from the driveway of the fire station itself. The Hawaii County General Plan contains Goals, Policies and Standards intended to preserve areas of natural beauty and scenic vistas from encroachment. The Plan does not contain any references to this area.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Except for extremely minor, temporary effects during construction, the project would not impact air quality, scenery or noise levels. Additional long-term impact to ambient noise in the area is expected to be minor, consisting mostly of short-duration noise associated with responses to emergency. This is generally considered an acceptable trade-off for improved fire protection. The Pahala Fire Station is not located within a visually sensitive area; therefore, the expansion of the facility would not adversely impact the scenic quality of the area. No mitigation is necessary or proposed.

3.2.5 Hazardous Substances, Toxic Waste and Hazardous Conditions

Based on onsite inspection and discussion with fire department personnel, it appears that the site does not have hazardous or toxic substances or any other hazardous conditions that are not part of normal fire station operations. Other than fuel, there are no hazardous substances stored above or below ground at the site. All activities, including fuel storage, are in compliance with applicable state and federal regulations.
3.3 Socioeconomic and Cultural

3.3.1 Land Use, Designations and Controls

Existing Environment

The site of the proposed facility is under the jurisdiction of the County of Hawaii. The facility is located on the makai portion of TMK 9-6-23:44. Pahala Park occupies the mauka portion of the parcel. A chain-link fence and a grass-covered embankment, topped with several large trees, separate the two facilities.

The subject property is within the State Land Use Urban District. County zoning is RS-10 and RS-15 (Single-Family Residential 10,000 and 15,000 square feet). The part occupied by the Fire Station is RS-10. The proposed project is a permitted use within this designation. The land use in and around the site is mainly residential, and the park, hospital and fire station that are clustered together are considered to be compatible uses within this designation.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The facility is compatible with and will support adjacent land uses. The expansion occupies a negligible amount of area in the context of the large (over 5 acres) parcel, which consists mostly of unused land with no recreational expansion currently planned. Furthermore, the expansion occurs essentially in the driveway of the existing fire station and thus does not in any way substantially affect recreational area or uses.

3.3.2 Socioeconomic Characteristics

Existing Environment: Social Characteristics

The project occurs within and would affect the town of Pahala and the district of Ka’u. The immediately surrounding area contains single-family residences, the Ka’u Hospital and Pahala Park. Table 1 provides information on the socioeconomic characteristics of this area, along with those of Hawaii County as a whole for comparison.

Impacts

The project would provide better fire, emergency medical and civil defense services for Pahala, and thus would have a beneficial impact on the district. Residents of the district who were consulted as part of this EA universally supported the project. Some expressed the desire that a fire station could also be constructed in Naalehu.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTERISTIC</th>
<th>GEOGRAPHIC AREAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hawaii Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>120,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Caucasian</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Filipino</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Hawaiian</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Under 18 Years</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Over 65 Years</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent 10-64 Years With Work</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability/Mobility/Self Care Limit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Area (square miles)</td>
<td>4,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Over 25 Years W/High School Diploma</td>
<td>77.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Over 16 Years in Labor Force</td>
<td>64.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$33,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Below the Poverty Level</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units</td>
<td>48,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Owner Occupied Housing</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Contract Rent Value</td>
<td>$428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Home Price</td>
<td>$113,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.3 Archaeology and Historic Sites

Environmental Setting

Inspection of the site revealed no apparent historic sites or archaeological remains. It is unlikely that such resources would be present, as construction of the Fire Station, which took place in the 1980s, involved complete disturbance of the site. The State Historic Preservation Division was consulted by letter in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act to determine whether any properties on or eligible for the National or State Registers of Historic Places would be affected by the proposed project. The agency concurred in a letter of 9 March 1999 that the proposed project "should have no effect on any known historic resources" (see Appendix 1B).

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Adverse impacts to archeological or historic resources due to the project are not expected to occur.

Mitigation Measure: If any human remains, charcoal deposits or artifacts are encountered during construction, work will cease immediately and the State Historic Preservation Division will be consulted to determine the appropriate mitigation.

3.4 Public Facilities

A County road provides access to the site. Electricity, phone and water lines serve the existing facility and could be extended to the proposed facility expansion with no direct or indirect impact to these services.

3.5 Secondary and Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts result when implementation of several projects that individually have limited impacts combine to produce more severe impacts or conflicts in mitigation measures. The adverse effects of the project — very minor and temporary disturbance to air quality, noise and visual quality during construction — are very limited in severity, nature and geographic scale. There are no projects being undertaken nearby which would combine in such a way as to produce adverse cumulative effects or involve a commitment for larger actions.
The project would not involve commitment to larger actions or otherwise induce secondary impacts.

3.6 Required Permits and Approvals

Construction of the facility will require the following:

County of Hawaii:

- Building Permit
- Plan Approval

3.7 Consistency with Government Plans and Policies

3.7.1 Hawaii County General Plan

The General Plan for the County of Hawaii is a policy document for the long-range comprehensive development of the island of Hawaii (Hawaii County Planning Department 1989). The Plan specifically identifies expanding fire protection for Pahala and Naalehu (p. 43). Other relevant aspects of the General Plan include the following:

I. Public Facilities: Goals, Policies and Standards:

- Encourage the provision of public facilities that effectively service community needs and seek ways of improving public service through better and more functional facilities which are in keeping with the environmental and aesthetic concerns of the community;

- The County shall continue to seek ways of improving public service through the coordination of service and by maximizing the use of personnel and facilities;

- Stations in outlying districts shall be based on population to be served and response time rather than on geographic district.

Courses of Action: Ka’u Protective Services:

- Fire protection for more adequate coverage of Naalehu and Pahala shall be encouraged;

- Expand/Improve facilities as necessary.

The proposed project specifically satisfies relevant goals, objectives, policies and courses of action related to land use and public facilities, and is not inconsistent with any other aspect of the General Plan.
PART 4: ANTICIPATED DETERMINATION

The proposed project will not significantly alter the environment and impacts will be minimal. Therefore, it is anticipated that a finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) will be filed and that the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not warranted.

PART 5: FINDINGS AND REASONS

Chapter 11-200-12, Hawaii Administrative Rules, outlines those factors agencies must consider when determining whether a project has significant effects:

1. The proposed project will not involve an irrevocable commitment or loss or destruction of any natural or cultural resources. No valuable natural or cultural resource would be involved, committed or lost.

2. The proposed project will not curtail the range of beneficial uses of the environment. No restriction of beneficial uses would occur, as the site is already committed to fire station purposes.

3. The proposed project will not conflict with the State’s long-term environmental policies. The State’s long-term environmental policies are set forth in Chapter 344, HRS. The broad goals of this policy are to conserve natural resources and enhance the quality of life. A number of specific guidelines support these goals, including those calling for expansion and improvement of protective services. No aspect of the proposed project conflicts with these guidelines and the project supports guidelines encouraging more adequate fire protection of Naalehu and Pahala. In summary, the project is environmentally benign and is consistent with all elements of the State’s long-term environmental policies as expressed in Chapter 344, HRS.

4. The proposed project will not substantially affect the economic or social welfare of the community or State. The social welfare of the Ka’u community will benefit from the addition of protective facilities. The expansion occupies a negligible amount of area in the context of the 5 acre, mostly vacant parcel, is restricted essentially to the driveway of the existing fire station, and does not in any substantial way subtract from recreational area.

5. The proposed project does not substantially affect public health in any detrimental way. Public health will benefit and will not be affected in any adverse way.

6. The proposed project will not involve substantial secondary impacts, such as population changes or effects on public facilities. No such effects would occur.

7. The proposed project will not involve a substantial degradation of environmental quality. The project would not degrade environmental quality.
8. The proposed project will not substantially affect any rare, threatened or endangered species of flora or fauna or habitat. No rare, threatened or endangered species of flora or fauna are known to exist on the project site.

9. The proposed project is not one, which is individually limited but cumulatively may have considerable effect upon the environment or involves a commitment for larger actions. The project is not related to other activities in the region in such a way as to produce adverse cumulative effects or involve a commitment for larger actions. All cumulative impacts associated with the project are beneficial.

10. The proposed project will not detrimentally affect air or water quality or ambient noise levels. No substantial effects to air, water, or ambient noise would occur. Very minor, temporary effects would occur during construction.

11. The project is not located in any environmentally sensitive area such as a flood plain, tsunami zone, erosion-prone area, geologically hazardous land, estuary, fresh water, or coastal area. There is potential for exposure to earthquake and volcanic hazard, however there are no reasonable alternatives that would avoid such exposure.

12. The project will not substantially affect scenic vistas and viewplanes identified in county or state plans or studies. The project will not have adverse scenic effects or impact in any way views identified in the Hawaii County General Plan or other plans.

13. The project will not require substantial energy consumption. Negligible amounts of energy input will be required for construction.

For the reasons above, the proposed project will not have any significant effect in the context of Chapter 343, Hawaii Revised Statues and Section 11-200-12 of the State Administrative Rules.
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APPENDIX 1A

PRECONSULTATION COMMENT LETTERS
In Reply Refer To: EAS

Ron Terry
Geo Metrician
HC2 9575
Keaau, Hawaii 96749

RE: Informal Consultation under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act for the Proposed Addition to the Pahala Fire Station, Hawaii, Hawaii

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) has reviewed the information provided in your January 19, 1999, letter requesting the Service's concurrence with your determination that the referenced action will not affect any listed, proposed, or candidate endangered or threatened species for which the Service has jurisdiction. The proposed addition to the Pahala Fire Station will consist of a 1,500 square-foot metal building to be located within the driveway of the existing Pahala Fire Station. The Service offers the following comments for your consideration.

No significant adverse impacts to fish and wildlife resources are expected to result from the proposed project and no endangered, threatened, proposed, or candidate species are known to occur in the vicinity of the proposed Pahala Fire Station. Therefore, the Service concurs with your determination that the proposed project will not affect any listed, proposed, or candidate species and the requirements of section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (Act) have been satisfied. However, obligations under section 7 of the Act must be reconsidered by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development if (1) new information reveals impacts of this defined action that may affect listed species or critical habitat in a manner that was not previously considered, (2) this action is subsequently modified in a manner not previously considered in this assessment, or (3) a new species is listed or critical habitat is determined that may be affected by the identified action.

We appreciate your concern for threatened and endangered species and the opportunity to comment on the proposed project. If you have any questions, please contact Fish and Wildlife Biologist Elizabeth Sharpe at (808) 541-3441.

Sincerely,

Robert P. Smith
Pacific Islands Manager
APPENDIX 1B

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO DRAFT EA
June 16, 1999

Memorandum:

To: Julie Jacobson, Councilmember
    Hawaii County Council

From: Edward Bumatay, Fire Chief

Subject: 1998 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program
          Pahala Fire Station Apparatus/Multi-Purpose Facility
          Construction Project
          TMK: 9-6-23:44, Kaʻu, Island of Hawaii
          Comments on Draft Environmental Assessment

Thank you for your comment letter dated May 5, 1999, on the Pahala Fire Station Draft
EA in which you express your support for the expansion of the fire station.

EDWARD BUMATAY
Fire Chief

xc: Edwin S. Taira, Office of Housing and Community Development
June 16, 1999

Memorandum:

To: Virginia Goldstein, Planning Director

From: Edward Bumatay, Fire Chief

Subject: 1998 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program
Pahala Fire Station Apparatus/Multi-Purpose Facility Construction Project
TMK: 9-6-23:44, Ka‘u, Island of Hawaii
Comments on Draft Environmental Assessment

Thank you for your comment letter dated April 30, 1999, on the Pahala Fire Station Draft EA. In response to your comments:

1) Figure 3 in the EA will be modified to show the existing fire station, the planned expansion, and the recreation center.
2) Section 3.3.1 will be clarified per your letter.
3) We will include a discussion of the proposed action’s effect (or lack of it) on recreation and recreational facilities in Section 3.3.

Again, thank you for your detailed review and comments.

EDWARD BUMATAY
Fire Chief

xc: Edwin S. Taira, Office of Housing and Community Development
June 16, 1999

Mr. Mike Richardson, Biologist
Pacific Island Ecoregion
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
P.O. Box 50088
Honolulu, HI 96850

Dear Mr. Richardson:

Subject: 1998 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program
Pahala Fire Station Apparatus/Multi-Purpose Facility
Construction Project
TMK: 9-6-23:64, Ka'u, Island of Hawaii
Comments on Draft Environmental Assessment

Thank you for your comment letter dated May 20, 1999, on the Pahala Fire Station
Draft EA in which you stated that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has no objection
to the proposed project based on the information supplied.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Fire Chief

xc: Edwin S. Taira, Office of Housing and Community Development
June 16, 1999

Memorandum:

To: Wayne Carvalho, Chief of Police

From: Edward Bumatay, Fire Chief

Subject: 1998 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program
Pahala Fire Station Apparatus/Multi-Purpose Facility
Construction Project
TMK: 9-6-23:44, Ka'u, Island of Hawaii
Comments on Draft Environmental Assessment

Thank you for your comment letters dated May 6, 1999, and June 1, 1999, on the
Pahala Fire Station Draft EA in which you state that your department does not foresee
any adverse impact from the proposed project.

EDWARD BUMATAY
Fire Chief

xc: Edwin S. Taira, Office of Housing and Community Development
June 16, 1999

Ms. Genevieve Salmonson, Director
Office of Environmental Quality Control
State of Hawai’i
235 South Beretania Street, Suite 702
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Ms. Salmonson:

Subject: 1998 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program
Pahala Fire Station Apparatus/Multi-Purpose Facility
Construction Project
TMK: 9-6-23:44, Ka’u, Island of Hawaii
Comments on Draft Environmental Assessment

Thank you for your letter dated May 26, 1999 on the Draft EA. In response to your specific comments:

1) Two-side pages. The Final EA will be printed on two sides.

2) Determination. The offending statement has been removed.

3) Seismic risk. We agree that there is no relation between these two ideas. This sentence has been removed. The fact that the site is paved and level is already contained in the earlier basic description of the site.

4) No Action as a Viable Alternative. In the Draft EA, the No Action Alternative is viable in the sense that it is an available option that is being been fully considered. Section 2.2, despite its brevity, contains a full explanation of the impacts of no action. We see no need to repeat the lack of temporary impacts in various sections of the EA. The Final EA will state that the County of Hawaii has selected the proposed project as the alternative it intends to implement.
Ms. Genevieve Salmonson, Director  
Page 2  
June 16, 1999

Again, thank you for your comments.  

Sincerely,  

EDWARD BUMATAY  
Fire Chief

xc: Edwin S. Taira, Office of Housing and Community Development
June 16, 1999

Memorandum:

To: Jiro Sumada, Deputy Chief Engineer
   Department of Public Works

Attn: Galen Kuba, Engineering Division Chief

From: Edward Bumatay, Fire Chief

Subject: 1998 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program
          Pahala Fire Station Apparatus/Multi-Purpose Facility
          Construction Project
          TMK: 9-6-23:44, Ka'ū, Island of Hawaii
          Comments on Draft Environmental Assessment

Thank you for your comment letter dated May 3, 1999, on the Pahala Fire Station Draft EA. Construction contractors will be informed of the conditions required by the County of Hawaii.

Edward Bumatay
Fire Chief

xc: Edwin S. Taira, Office of Housing and Community Development
June 16, 1999

Mr. Don Hibbard, Administrator
State Historic Preservation Division
Hawaii State Department of Land and Natural Resources
601 Kamokila Blvd., Room 555
Honolulu, Hawaii 96707

Dear Mr. Hibbard:

Subject: 1998 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program
Pahala Fire Station Apparatus/Multi-Purpose Facility
Construction Project
TMK: 9-6-23:44, Ka‘u, Island of Hawaii
Comments on Draft Environmental Assessment

Thank you for your letter dated March 9, 1999, stating that the addition will have “no effect” on significant historic sites.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
EDWARD BUMATAIY
Fire Chief

xc: Edwin S. Taira, Office of Housing and Community Development
March 9, 1999

Ron Terry, Ph.D.
Geo Metrician
HC 2 Box 9575
Keaau, Hawaii 96749

Dear Dr. Terry:

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment for Addition to Pahala Fire Station
TMK 9-6-23:44, Pahala, Hawaii

Thank you for the letter dated January 14, 1999, and resent March 5, 1999, regarding the environmental assessment for an addition to the Pahala Fire Station. Since the existing building was constructed in the 1980's and the area has been previously disturbed, we concur that the addition should have 'no effect' on any known historic resources.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. If you have any questions, please contact Carol Ogata at 692-8032.

Aloha,

DON HIBBARD, Administrator
State Historic Preservation Division

CO:jk
MEMORANDUM

TO: Edwin S. Taira
   Assistant Housing Administrator

FROM: Virginia Goldstein
       Planning Director

SUBJECT: 1998 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program
          Draft Environmental Assessment (DEA) for the Pahala Fire Station
          Apparatus/Multipurpose Facility Construction Project
          TMK: 9-6-23; Portion of 44; Pahala Village, Pahala 1st & 2nd, Kaʻu, Hawaiʻi

Thank you for your memorandum dated April 27, 1999, transmitting a copy of the above-described DEA for our review and comment.

We have completed our review and have the following comments to offer for your consideration:

1. The Final Environmental Assessment should contain a site plan of the entire property, showing the location of all structures and features. Only a partial site plan is included within the DEA, so a person not familiar with the area may have difficulty in locating the existing fire station.

2. The subject property is zoned Single Family Residential-10,000 square feet (RS-10) and Single Family Residential-15,000 square feet (RS-15). The area zoned RS-15 is situated along Maile Street. The proposed Fire Station expansion will occur within that portion of the affected property zoned RS-10. Section 3.3.1-Land Use, Designation and Controls should be clarified.

3. The DEA does a great job in supporting a FONSI, but there is one additional area we feel must be addressed to complete the comprehensive review. The DEA focuses on the
construction of the fire station addition, but does not address the affect of such expansion upon the project site, which has been set aside for park purposes. Given the location and limited nature of the expansion improvements, we feel that the proposed project will not have a significant adverse effect upon existing and potential recreational uses of the property. We would appreciate confirmation of this within the DEA.

Thank you for giving our office the opportunity to comment on the DEA. Please contact Daryn Arai of this office should you have any questions.

DSA:gp
fwp@pert@Pert

cc: OEQC
Fire Department
P&R
May 6, 1999

TO : EDWIN S. TAIRA, ASSISTANT HOUSING ADMINISTRATOR
FROM : WAYNE G. CARVALHO, POLICE CHIEF
SUBJECT : 1998 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG) PROGRAM
PAHALA FIRE STATION APPARATUS/MULTI-PURPOSE FACILITY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA)

Staff has reviewed the draft environmental assessment for the above-referenced project and does not foresee any adverse impact with the construction of the proposed addition to the Pahala Fire Station.

RTN: lk
June 1, 1999

TO: EDWIN S. TAIRA, ASSISTANT HOUSING ADMINISTRATOR
FROM: JAMES S. CORREA, DEPUTY POLICE CHIEF, ACTING POLICE CHIEF

SUBJECT: 1998 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG) PROGRAM
PAHALA FIRE STATION APPARATUS/MULTI-PURPOSE FACILITY
CONSTRUCTION PROJECT
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA)

Staff has no comments to offer on the State Environmental Review process for the
above-referenced project.

RTN: lk
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
COUNTY OF HAWAII
HILO, HAWAII

DATE: May 3, 1999

COUNTY OF HAWAII

Memorandum

To: ROYCE SHIROMA
OFFICE OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

From: GALEN M. KUBA, DIVISION CHIEF
ENGINEERING DIVISION

SUBJECT: DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
PAHALA FIRE STATION APPARATUS/MULTI-PURPOSE FACILITY
Pahala, Ka‘u, Hawaii
TMK: 3 / 9-6-23: 44

We acknowledge receipt of your letter concerning the subject matter, and provide you with our comments as follows:

1. Any building construction shall conform to all requirements of code and statutes of the County of Hawaii.

2. All development generated runoff shall be disposed on site and shall not be directed toward any adjacent properties.

3. All earthwork and grading shall be in conformance with Chapter 10, Erosion and Sediment Control, of the Hawaii County Code.

4. Any work within the County right-of-way shall be in conformance with Chapter 22, Streets and Sidewalks, of the Hawaii County Code. Kamani Street and Pa‘au‘au Street, fronting the subject property, are County roads.

Should there be any questions concerning this matter, please feel free to contact Mr. Casey Yanagihara in our Engineering Division at (808)961-8327.

CKY
May 5, 1999

MEMORANDUM

TO: Edwin S. Taira
   Assistant Housing Administrator

FROM: Julie Jacobson
       Hawai'i County Councilmember

SUBJECT: Response to Submitted 1998 Community Development Block Grant Program - Pahala Fire Station Apparatus/Multi-Purpose Facility Construction Project - Draft Environmental Assessment

Thank you for presenting me the opportunity to review the subject submission.

Please accept my appreciation for all your efforts expended on this project.

I wish to add my support to this worthwhile project and trust its accomplishment will be a true asset to the public in the Ka'u area.

Mahalo.

District 6 - Upper Puna, Ka'u & South Kona
MEMORANDUM

TO: Royce Shiroma, Hawaii County Dept. of Housing

FROM: Mike Richardson, Biologist, Ecological Services, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Honolulu

RE: Pahala Fire Station Improvement Project

This memo confirms in writing the content of my telephone call to your office on May 7, 1999. The Service has no objections to the proposed Pahala Fire Station Improvement Project based upon the information contained in the project description and the measures proposed to protect nearby environmental quality during construction.
Edwin Taira  
County of Hawai'i Housing and Community Development  
50 Wailuku Drive  
Hilo, Hi 96720

Attention: Royce Shiroma

Dear Mr. Taira:

Subject: Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for Pahala Fire Station

We have the following comments to offer:

1. **Two-sided pages:** In order to reduce bulk and conserve paper, we recommend printing on both sides of the pages in the final document.

2. **Determination:**

   The last sentence of Section 1.3 states, "If this study finds that significant impacts are expected to occur as a result of the proposed action, then either an EIS would be prepared or mitigation measures would be implemented to reduce all impacts to insignificant levels." Please be advised that the second option is not allowable under the state EIS law.

   According to HRS 343-5(b) on requirements for filing an environmental impact statement, ".... A statement shall be required if the agency finds that the proposed action may have a significant effect on the environment." If it is found that significant impacts may occur as a result of this proposed action, then an EIS must be filed.

3. **Seismic Risk:** Section 3.2.2, *Lava Flow and Earthquake Hazards*, notes that:  
   "Zone 4 areas are at risk from major earthquake damage, especially to structures that are poorly designed or built. The area where the proposed facility is to be built is level and paved therefore, no problems in site design and preparation are anticipated to occur." Please explain how a level paved construction area ameliorates the damaging effects of seismic action.
4. Alternatives: Section 2.2, No Action, considers the "No Action as a viable alternative." If this is a viable alternative, please discuss this more fully in the final EA. If "no action" is not a viable alternative, please correct this in the final EA.

If you have any questions, please call Nancy Heinrich at 586-4185.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
GENEVIEVE SALMONSON
Director

c: Ron Terry
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PAHALA FIRE STATION